



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/701,828

11/04/2003

Dan Kikinis

P1503D2

7049

23623 7590 11/12/2009
TUROCY & WATSON, LLP
127 Public Square
57th Floor, Key Tower
CLEVELAND, OH 44114

EXAMINER

ELAHEE, MD S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2614

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

11/12/2009

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docket1@thepatentattorneys.com
hholmes@thepatentattorneys.com
lpasterchek@thepatentattorneys.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/701,828	Applicant(s) KIKINIS, DAN	
	Examiner MD S. ELAHEE	Art Unit 2614	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 August 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 17-28 ans 30-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 17-28 ans 30-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This action is responsive to an amendment filed on 08/07/2009. Claims 17-28 and 30-37 are pending. Claims 1-16 and 29 have been previously cancelled.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed on 08/07/2009 Remarks have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection which is deemed appropriate to address all of the needs at this time.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
5. Claims 17-24, 33, 36 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Lemaire et al.** (U.S. 5,444,768) in view of **Perlman et al.** (U.S. 5,896,444).

Regarding claim 17, with respect to Figures 1A and 2, **Lemaire** teaches an electronic document answering machine comprising:

A central processing unit (CPU) 40, memory 15, 54-58, and modem 42 with a telephone connection (col.8, lines 18-22);

Lemaire further teaches a system for rendering documents (fig.2; labels 13 and 20; col.7, lines 6-21, col.9, lines 18-31),

Lemaire further teaches an alert device for signaling that at least one new document is waiting to be reviewed (col.7, lines 6-21);

Lemaire further teaches an input device to signal rendering of at least one of the at least one new document (col.5, lines 36-66), and

Lemaire further teaches a digital port for connecting to a host personal computer (PC), wherein the electronic document answering machine connects to at least one remote sources, receives and stores at least one digital document in the memory, and activates the alert device as a new document is stored, and wherein, in response to input device receiving an input, the electronic document answering machine renders stored documents, and whereto the electronic

document answering machine is adapted to transmit stored documents to the PC for processing (fig. 4-5, fig.6, label 134,146; col.6, lines 55-65, col.14, lines 3-24).

Lemaire does not teach the following limitations,

"periodic time intervals"

However, it is obvious that **Lemaire** can be modified to accommodate the limitation. This is because **Lemaire** teaches a polling mechanism which scans interfaces at predetermine times (Col. 11, lines 41-55 and Col. 14, lines 50-54). These teachings suggest predetermined times (periodic time intervals) for accessing messaging facilities and retrieving audio and e-mail messages. **Periman** teaches the limitations by accessing messaging facilities at regular (periodic) intervals (Col. 8, lines 5-11). Having the cited art at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add periodic access capability to **Lemaire's** invention for accessing messaging facilities as taught by **Perlman's** invention in order to provide access of messaging facilities at regular intervals.

Regarding claim 18, **Lemaire** teaches the electric document answering machine of claim 17 wherein the system for rendering stored documents comprises a speaker and voice synthesis apparatus (fig.4).

Regarding claim 19, **Lemaire** teaches the electronic document answering machine of claim 17 wherein the system for rendering stored documents comprises a display apparatus (col.9, lines 64-68).

Regarding claim 20, **Lemaire** teaches the electronic document answering machine of claim 17 adapted for use by the PC as a modem (fig.6, label 130).

Regarding claim 21, **Lemaire** teaches the electronic document answering machine of claim 17 wherein the modem is operated by the CPU and has no separate CPU (fig.6, label 130).

Regarding claim 22, **Lemaire** teaches the electronic document answering machine as in claim 17 wherein the at least one remote source includes an Internet mail server, and the at least one new document includes at least one e-mail message addressed to a particular user (col.2, lines 40-45, col.3, lines 42-46, 60-63).

Regarding claim 23, **Lemaire** teaches the electronic document answering machine of claim 17 wherein the alert device includes at least one light emitting diode (LED) and the input is a pushbutton having the at least one LED integrated in the pushbutton (fig.1A, labels 38,33).

Regarding claim 24, **Lemaire** teaches the electronic document answering machine of claim 23 further comprising a second pushbutton adapted for applying and removing power to power-using elements (fig.1A, labels 30,32,34 or 36).

Claims 33 and 36 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 17. Furthermore, with respect to Figures 1A and 2, **Lemaire** teaches a computing device, comprising:

a retriever that accesses remote sources and retrieves and stores in memory at least one new digital document addressed to an addressee, wherein the at least one new digital

document is not already stored in memory of the computing device (fig. 4-5, fig.6, label 134,146; col.6, lines 55-65, col.14, lines 3-24); and

Lemaire further teaches an input device having at least one light emitting diode (LED) integrated in the input device, wherein the at least one LED signals that the at least one new digital document is stored in memory and ready for review, and wherein activation of the input device initiates rendering of the at least one new digital document (fig.1A, labels 38,33; col.5, lines 36-66, col.7, lines 6-21).

Regarding claim 37, **Lemaire** teaches the rendering includes rendering the at least one new digital document during a time period over which no other new digital document is rendered (fig.1A, labels 38,33; col.5, lines 36-66).

6. Claims 25-28, 34 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Lemaire et al.** (U.S. 5,444,768) in view of **Perlman et al.** (U.S. 5,896,444) further in view of **Clark et al.** (U.S. 5,666,530).

Claims 25, 34 and 35 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 17. Furthermore, with respect to Figures 1A and 2, **Lemaire** teaches an electronic document answering machine in a personal computer (PC), the electronic document answering system comprising:

Means for retrieving, wherein the means for retrieving is configured for accessing remote resources and retrieving and storing digital documents (fig. 4-5, fig.6, label 134,146; col.6, lines 55-65, col.14, lines 3-24);

Lemaire further teaches means for providing a light emitting diode (LED) alert, wherein the means for providing a light emitting diode alert is configured for LED illumination for signaling a user that one or more new digital documents have been retrieved and stored and are ready for review (fig.1A, labels 38,33; col.7, lines 6-21); and

Lemaire further teaches means for initializing, wherein the means for initializing includes the means for providing an LED alert integrated in the means for initializing for signaling the electronic document answering system to initiate review of the stored documents (fig.1A, labels 38,33; col.5, lines 36-66),

However, **Lemaire** in view of **Perlman** does not teach the following limitations:

“wherein the electronic document answering system in the PC is adapted to operate using means for processing and means for storage operably coupled with the PC and wherein the means for storage includes special operating code provided for the electronic document answering system, for the electronic document answering system to operate during periods of time when the PC is in reduced-power mode as well as when the PC is in full operating mode”

Clark teaches wherein the electronic document answering system in the PC is adapted to operate using means for processing and means for storage operably coupled with the PC and wherein the means for storage includes special operating code provided for the electronic document answering system, for the electronic document answering system to operate during

periods of time when the PC is in reduced-power mode as well as when the PC is in full operating mode (col.5, lines 24-37 and 65-col.6, line 15). Having the cited art at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add power-down capabilities to **Lemaire's** invention in view of **Perlman's** invention for providing reduced power consumption as taught by **Clark's** invention in order to provide flexible operation capabilities.

Regarding claim 26, **Lemaire** teaches the system of claim 25 wherein the digital documents include e-mail (col.2, lines 40-45, col.3, lines 42-46, 60-63).

Regarding claim 27, **Lemaire** teaches the system of claim 25 wherein the means for providing an LED alert and the means for initializing are in a means for receiving input in communication with the PC (fig.1A).

Regarding claim 28, **Lemaire** teaches the system of claim 27 wherein the means for providing an LED alert is an LED in a standard keyboard, wherein the means for providing an LED alert is adapted to serve as an alert apparatus, and a means for entering input is a standard key on the means for receiving input, wherein the means for entering input is adapted to serve as the means for initializing (fig.1A, labels 38, 33).

7. Claims 30-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Cooper et al.** (U.S. 6,052,442) in view of **Perlman et al.** (U.S. 5,896,444).

Claims 30, 31 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 17. Furthermore, with respect to Figures 1-3, **Cooper** teaches a computing device, comprising:

a memory for storing electronic documents having a delivery address (fig.6, label 106; col.1, lines 20-29, col.4, lines 37-43);

Cooper further at least one processor configured to access the electronic documents in the memory and interface to at least one network store of electronic documents to receive a new set of electronic documents having the delivery address and to store the new set of electronic documents in the memory (col.1, lines 20-29, col.4, lines 37-43, 59-67);

Cooper further teaches an alert device that renders at least one of audio or video indicating receipt of the new set of electronic documents (fig. 2B, labels 25, 26; col.6, lines 19-29); and

Cooper further teaches an input device to request rendering of the electronic documents of the new set of electronic documents, and wherein the electronic documents stored in the memory are transferable to another computing device for processing (col.4, lines 43-47, col.7, lines 15-20).

Cooper does not teach the following limitations,

“Wherein the computing device is communicatively coupled to a television and the alert device renders the video indicating receipt of the new set of electronic documents and the television displays the rendered video”

Periman teaches Wherein the computing device is communicatively coupled to a television and the alert device renders the video indicating receipt of the new set of electronic

documents and the television displays the rendered video (Col. 4, lines 16-20, Col. 7, line 63-Col. 8, line 11). Having the cited art at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the feature of wherein the computing device is communicatively coupled to a television and the alert device renders the video indicating receipt of the new set of electronic documents and the television displays the rendered video to **Cooper's** invention for accessing messaging facilities as taught by **Perlman's** invention in order to provide a display of video message in a larger screen so that user can enjoy watching message in big display.

Regarding claim 32, **Cooper** teaches that the transferring includes transferring to another computing device for display by said another computing device (col.8, lines 6-12).

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MD S. ELAHEE whose telephone number is (571)272-7536.

The examiner can normally be reached on MON-FRI.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, FAN TSANG can be reached on (571)272-7547. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/MD S ELAHEE/
MD SHAFIUL ALAM ELAHEE
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2614
November 10, 2009